

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 are rejected. No claims have been allowed. Claims 1, 7, 12, and 18 are independent. Claims 1, 7 and 18 have been amended.

Cited Art

The Action cites Gase, U.S. Patent No. 6,363,081 (hereinafter “Gase”); Hong et al., U.S. H2065 H (hereinafter “Hong”); Cho et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,922,728 (hereinafter “Cho”); and Firth et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,987,517 (hereinafter “Firth”).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The Action rejects Claims 1-6 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, Applicants have amended the claims to alleviate the Examiner’s concerns.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102

The Action rejects claims 12, 14, and 16 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Gase. Applicants respectfully submit the claims are allowable over the cited art. For a 102(b) rejection to be proper, the cited art must show each and every element as set forth in a claim. (See MPEP § 2131.01.) However, the cited art does not describe each and every element of the claims as amended. Accordingly, Applicants request that all rejections be withdrawn.

Gase discloses a system where a primary application is connected first and then a monitoring application submits a registration request to the primary application over a registration port. (Col. 4, lines 51-56). When “the primary applications receive data packets over their contested ports, they retransmit the packets to the monitoring application 56.” (Col. 4, lines 57-60). The registration ports are shown at 58(1) – 58(3) in Figure 2 of Gase.

Claim 12 includes features not shown or suggested in Gase. In particular, claim 12 requires “a connection manager for establishing via the hardware device a connection shared by plural applications communicating with remote resources.”

First, Gase does not use a connection manager. Instead, in Gase, a monitoring application has to request that a primary application retransmit packets to the monitoring application. Second, the connection in Gase is not “shared by plural applications” as required by claim 12. Instead, Gase clearly requires retransmission from one application to another: the primary application retransmits the packets to the monitoring application 56. (Col. 4, lines 57-60). Thus, the monitoring application does not even appear to be connected to a remote resource.

Therefore, claim 12 and claims 14 and 16 should be in condition for allowance.

Patentability of Claims 1-11, 13, 15, and 17-20 Under 35 USC § 103(a)

The Action rejects claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10, 13, 15, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gase in view of Hong.

As described above, Gase does not show a connection manager as required by independent claims 1, 7 and 18.

Gase discloses a system where a primary application is connected first and then a monitoring application must submit a registration request to each primary application over a registration port. (Col. 4, lines 51-56). Applicant’s representative believes that the monitoring application and the primary application are not sharing a communication channel. Instead, when “the primary applications receive data packets over their contested ports, they retransmit the packets to the monitoring application 56.” (Col. 4, lines 57-60). The registration ports are shown at 58(1) – 58(3) in Figure 2 of Gase. Regarding disconnection, Gase states the following: “If the request is to drop registration..., the primary application removes the IP address of the secondary application from the distribution list and returns an unregistered confirmation over the registration port to the secondary application...” (Col. 5, lines 63-67).

In contrast, the present application describes a connection manager shown at 214 in Figure 2. The connection manager establishes the connection for the application(s). Thus, claim 1 has been amended to require the following:

“receiving, in a connection manager that is separate from the plural applications, a connection request comprising a process identification and saving the process identification in a data structure;

establishing a connection, using the connection manager...”.

Gase does not show using a connection manager as claimed, but instead requires establishing a primary application that retransmits packets to a monitoring application.

Claim 7 requires “receiving, in the connection manager, a second request from a second application for connection to the same remote resource as the first application; sharing the connection to the remote resource between the first application and the second application”

Thus, claim 7 includes “sharing the connection to the remote resource between the first application and the second application”, which is clearly not done in Gase. Instead, in Gase, one application receives packets and retransmits them to the other application. (Col. 4, lines 57-60). This cannot be considered “sharing the connection to the remote resource” as required by claim 7.

Amended claim 18 also requires a connection manager and should be allowable for the reasons stated above.

Using a connection manager to create a shared connection to a remote resource is clearly a different structure than disclosed in Gase. Additionally, Hong, Cho and Firth (US 5,987,517) do not disclose using a connection manager or anything similar to create a shared connection as required by many of the independent claims.

It should be noted that claim 2 requires removing the process identification from the data structure and terminating the connection process after removing the identification. The Examiner cited Hong as disclosing this feature. However, Hong is not in the context of having a shared connection as required by claim 7, for example. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

The remaining claims are dependent claims and should be allowed for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

The claims in their present form should be allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By



Robert F. Scotti
Registration No. 39,830